

and a mixture of different first hybridization sequences; and

(d) reacting the compound intermediates in the sequences in each of the subsets formed in (c) with a second selected reagent,

whereby the nucleic acid tags direct the synthesis of the compounds.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated May 25, 2001 is respectfully requested. The applicant petitions the Commissioner for a 3-month extension of time. A separate petition accompanies this amendment. Claims 1-10 are currently under examination.

I. Amendments

The claims have been amended as set forth above in order to clarify the invention to the Examiner. Support for the amended method steps in claim 1 can be found on at least page 19, lines 6 - 9 of the specification.

No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned **"Version with Markings to Show Changes Made."**

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 1-10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is traversed in view of the following.

Applicants note that Group I, claims 1-10, were elected on March 21, 2001 in response to the Restriction Requirement mailed November 21, 2000. Thus, claim 12 is not currently under examination.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 as being indefinite for suggesting methods of tagging, making tags, or making compounds with tags, but being drawn to methods of making a plurality of compounds. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the claims are drawn to a method of tag-directed synthesis of a plurality of compounds.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 as being indefinite for reciting "a related reagent".